

**CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE
2018 ANNUAL REPORT**

This report is prepared in compliance with Article V of the Bylaws of the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC).

2018 Voting Members

Robert W. Bronkall CSAC- Chairman	Deputy Director of PW, Humboldt County 3033 H St., Room 17, Eureka, CA 95501
Hamid Bahadori ACSC – Vice Chair	Principal Transportation Engineer Auto Club of Southern California, 3333 Fairview Road Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Andrew Maximous LOCC	City of Santa Monica 1685 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90401
Pratyush Bhatia LOCC	Senior Civil Engineer City of Santa Clara 1500 Warburton Ave, Santa Clara, CA 95050
David Fleisch CSAC	Director, Transportation Department, Public Works Agency County of Ventura 800 S. Victoria Ave, Ventura, CA 9309
Duper Tong Caltrans	Office Chief, Traffic Engineering Division of Traffic Operations California Department of Transportation 1120 N Street, MS36, Sacramento, CA 95814
Lt. Rick Hatfield CHP	Special Projects Section California Highway Patrol 601 N. 7th Street, Sacramento, CA 95811
Mike Sallaberry Caltrans	Livable Streets Subdivision, SFMTA One S. Van Ness Ave, 7 th Fl. SF, CA 94103
Xavier Maltese AAA NCNU	AAA Northern CA, NV & UT Public Affairs Specialist 1277 Treat Blvd., Suite 1000, Walnut Creek, CA 94597
Bryan D. Jones Caltrans – Active Transportation	Assistant City Manager City of Eastvale 12363 Limonite Ave., Suite 910, Eastvale, CA 917525

The following alternate members were designated by the parent organizations to act in the absence of their appointed voting members:

2018 Alternate Members

Reza Moghissi CSAC	Division Chief, Maintenance and Operations Sacramento County 4100 Traffic Way, Sacramento, CA 95827
Vijay Talada Caltrans	Division of Traffic Operations- MS36 1120 N Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Marianne Kim ACSC	Auto Club of Southern California 3333 Fairview Road Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Zoubir A. Ouadah CSAC	County Traffic Engineer County of San Diego, DPW
John Moreno AAA NCNU	Manger, Public Affairs 1277 Treat Blvd., Suite 1000, Walnut Creek, CA 94597
Rock Miller Caltrans, Active Transportation	Stantec Consulting Services Inc. 38 Technology Drive Suite# 100, Irvine CA 92618-233
Tony Powers Caltrans, Active Transportation	Senior Engineer, Dokken Engineering 110 Blue Ravine Rd, Ste 200, Folsom, CA 95630
Doug Bilse LOCC	Senior Traffic Engineer, City of Carlsbad 1635 Faraday Carlsbad, CA 92007

Executive Secretary

Vijay Talada	Division of Traffic Operations- MS36 1120 N Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
--------------	---

ACSC – Automobile Club of Southern California	LOCC – League of California Cities
CSAC – California State Association of Counties	CHP- California Highway Patrol
AAA NCNU – AAA Northern CA, NV & UT	

2018 Meeting Locations

Date	Location
February 8, 2018	Santa Monica
May 10, 2018	Santa Rosa
August 9, 2018	San Diego

2018 CTCDC AGENDA ITEMS**Item No. Title****Consent Items**

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 18-01 | Update to Section 6F.109(CA) - (C47(CA)Series) Signs |
| 18-09 | Update to Section 2B.46 Parking, Standing, and Stopping Signs |

Requests for Experimentation

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 18-04 | Request to install a new regulatory sign related to school buses |
| 18-05 | Request for approval of proposed deviation from the State Standard sign panel SG49C(CA) |
| 18-15 | Request for experimentation with modified 4-section traffic control and R10-15b sign |
| 18-16 | Request to experiment: Non- standard red colored pavement |
| 18-17 | Proposal for experimental use of a nonstandard traffic control device – green stripe next to edge line. |
| 18-18 | Proposal for experimental use of red pavement markings at a railroad at-grade crossing. |
| 18-19 | Proposal for experimental use of non-standard traffic control device – signing for I-805 and SR – 94 transit only lane pilot project. |
| 13-07 | Request to Experiment with Bike Boxes- by National City – Final Report. |
| 16-07 | Request to Experiment with modified signage and pavement markings requiring vehicles to stop behind light rail vehicles stopped to board or alight passengers. – Final Report |
| 17-15 | Request for Experimentation – Red colored pavement markings for Transit Only Lanes in left turn only lanes- In person status report. |

Action Item

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 15-18 | Proposal for street names for bridges over Class I bikeway and at Class I bikeway intersections |
|-------|---|

Discussion Items

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 18-06 | Discussion on placing retroreflective material on the sign support for all School Zone signs and “Do not Enter” and “Wrong Way” signs |
| 18-07 | IA 11- Interim Approval for optional use RRFB- Termination |
| 18-08 | Report on Changes to the Minimum Yellow Light Change Interval Timing for Signalized Intersections |
| 18-11 | Yellow time sub-committee |
| 18-12 | Interim Approval 21 – Rectangular Rapid- Flashing Beacons at Crosswalks |
| 18-13 | Yellow Band |

Information Items

- | | |
|-------|--|
| 18-02 | Proposal to delete paragraph 07 in Section 1A.09 of the CA MUTCD |
| 18-03 | Proposed edits Section 4I.02 of CA MUTCD |
| 18-10 | Intersection Control Evaluation- Draft Language |
| 18-14 | Request for installation of new Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) Sponsor Acknowledgement Signs |

Tabled Items

Consent Items

18-01 Update to Section 6F.109(CA) Construction Funding Identification (C47(CA) Series) Signs
Action: Committee Member Tong stated that the item was not ready for discussion.

18-09 Update to Section 2B.46 Parking, Standing, and Stopping Signs
Action: The Committee approved recommendation to adopt a new regulatory sign allowing commercial vehicles to park up to 10 hours.

Discussion: Mr. Don Howe addressed the item stating at Rest Areas and Vista Points there is an 8 HOUR PARKING sign; however, the CA MUTCD is missing a permissive parking sign for commercial vehicle operators. Having a new sign will allow them to remain at facilities for up to 10 hours. Vice Chair Bahadori asked if the two signs are used in conjunction and Mr. Howe affirmed that. Language on the use of “private vehicles” or “commercial vehicles” was discussed to come up with a better term to reduce confusion. Committee Member Hatfield presented the question as to why the new sign is green instead of black and white. Mr. Howe responded that the white on green is a permissive regulatory sign specifying time.

Action Items

15-18 Proposal for street names for bridges over Class I bikeway and at Class I bikeway intersections
Action: The Committee recommended that Caltrans adopt proposed policy regarding signing for bridges over Class I bikeway and at Class I bikeway intersections

Discussion: Committee Member Tong reported that a subcommittee had drafted language for the proposal. Executive Secretary Talada gave the background and walked the committee through the language changes. Committee Member Tong moved to pass the item and Committee Member Maximous seconded it.

Request for Experimentations

18-04 Request to install a new regulatory sign related to school buses

Action: The Committee authorized the request to add the sign No Loaded School Buses. Committee Member Tong will work with CHP on the configurations.

18-05 Request for approval of proposed deviation from the State Standard sign panel SG49C(CA)

Action: The Committee approved the experiment.

18-15 Request for experimentation with modified 4-section traffic control and R10-15b sign

Action: The Committee approved the request for experimentation contingent to FHWA approval.

18-16 Request to experiment: Non-standard red colored pavement

Action: The Committee approved the request for experimentation with the red colored pavement.

18-17 Proposal for experimental use of a nonstandard traffic control device- green stripe next to edge line

Action: The motion to approve the request for experimentation could not be carried.

18-18 Proposal for experimental use of red pavement markings at a railroad at-grade crossing

Action: The Committee moved to approve the experiment pending FHWA approval for red pavement color.

- 18-19 Proposal for experimental use of non-standard traffic control device- signing for I-805 and SR-94 transit only lane pilot project
Action: The Committee approved the request for experimentation.
- 13-07 Request to Experiment with Bike Boxes- by National City – Final Report.
Action: The Committee moved to accept the report and get an optional statement for mandatory requirement.
- 16-07 Request to Experiment with modified signage and pavement markings requiring vehicles to stop behind light rail vehicles stopped to board or alight passengers-Final Report
Action: The Committee moved to close the experiment and to incorporate the signage in the city.
- 17-15 Request to Experiment – Red colored pavement markings for Transit Only Lanes in left turn only lanes – In person status report
Action: The Committee recommended that it be sent to FHWA and consider placing the average daily reduction in violations in the report.

Discussion Items

- 18-06 Discussion on placing retroreflective material on the sign support for all School Zones signs “Do Not Enter” and “Wrong way signs”

Discussion: Committee Member Tong stated that Caltrans would like to explore opportunities to improve safety and reduce the number of fatal collisions. An example Committee Member Tong brought up was adding retroreflective sleeves on the posts of signs. Committee Member Fleisch stated that he felt that the methods they are already using are more effective than adding a retroreflective sleeve. Committee Member Bhatia said that his preference would be to leave it as an option, which would enable a city to use it more selectively where it is needed. Committee Member Fleisch commented that the reality is that reflectivity is more effective at night when schools are not in session and pointed out the difference between the issues with freeway offramps, and issues with one-way or Do Not Enter locations. Committee Member Tong said that Caltrans would take these recommendations and comments into consideration.

- 18-07 IA 11 – Interim Approval for optional use RRFB – Termination

Discussion: Committee Member Tong stated FHWA had terminated IA 11-Optional use of RRFB. Committee Member Jones said that there is a lot of confusion out there because people have projects under construction that have identified this solution tool, and none of the alternatives are the same cost and effectiveness as the RRFB. The RRFBs are not being removed from a safety perspective from the FHWA – it is because attorneys could not stop a patent from being filed. Mr. Pyburn stated that there is a recently revised FAQ that talks about projects that are in construction. FHWA is supporting installation of devices that are already in the pipeline; but agencies should consider the cost of alternatives in the decision of whether to install the devices or not. Committee Member Bahadori has asked about using a variation of it, but Mr. Pyburn stated that he could not speculate on what would or would not violate the patent.

18-08 Report on Changes to the Minimum Yellow Light Change Interval timing for Signalized Intersections

Discussion: Jay Beeber, Executive Director of Safer Streets L.A., presented a study. Committee Member Bahadori posed the question of whether the CTCDC should now consider turning movements. The Committee could not reach an agreement last year. Three Committee Members agreed that they would like to focus on the yellow times. Committee Member Sallaberry felt that the Committee needs to continue looking at the situation with an additional study. Mr. Beeber responded that the studies they looked at showed that drivers cannot tell the difference in a fluctuation between three to six seconds. Committee Member Bahadori moved to take the next step and create a subcommittee. The motion was passed the Committee proceeded to form a subcommittee.

18-11 Yellow time sub-committee

Discussion: Committee member Zolfaghari reported that Caltrans has a list of people interested in the subcommittee. The list of people come from local agencies and Caltrans. Committee Member stated that this new committee is focused on left turn movements. Secretary Talada reported that he has 16 potential subcommittee members from traffic engineering consultants, cities, counties, but there is no Chair. Committee Member Zolfaghari nominated Vice Chair Bahadori as Subcommittee Chair. Motion passed.

18-12 Interim Approval 21 – Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacons at Crosswalks

Discussion: Secretary Talada reported that Caltrans, after receiving email feedback from CTCDC members, has put in a request for statewide blanket approval for the use of Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) in California. Caltrans has secured statewide blanket approval for the use of IA 21 from FHWA.

18-13 Yellow Band

Discussion: Chair Bronkall reported that he has been approached by Syroun Sanossian, SZS Engineering Access, Inc. about the feasibility of incorporating language currently in the California Building Code (CBC) into the MUTCD. Secretary Talada stated that this matter was discussed in 1986 at the CTCDC meeting. The consensus had been that the textured bands are not official traffic control devices and that a regulation for their use should not have been adopted following the provisions of Section 21400 of the CVC. Committee Member Jones stated that this is a traffic control devices manual, and the yellow bands are not traffic control. Language going into the manual requires research-scientific studies on effectiveness and usefulness. Committee Member Jones stated that typically, something gets into the MUTCD when local agency comes to the CTCDC with a Request for Experimentation; the agency then does research and evaluated. Committee Member Bhatia agreed that we need the research to be done and presented before going forward; it would be a large cost to all the cities of the state. Committee Member Jones added that FHWA approval would also be necessary for the experiment. Chair Bronkall suggested looking at the federal MUTCD as another avenue, rather than having California try to create its own unique standard.

Information Items

18-02 Proposal to delete paragraph 07 in Section 1A.09 of the CA MUTCD

Discussion: Executive Secretary Talada reported that a member of the California Legislative Council had questioned the value of this statement in the CA MUTCD. Committee Member Bahadori said that this issue has been going on for more than five decades. He did not see why this language needs to be in the CA MUTCD. Committee Member Fleisch had a different opinion. In 2011 the California Legislative Council arrived at the position that only licensed Civil Engineer can be responsible for fixed components, which included traffic control devices. The Traffic Committee from the Bureau of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors has looked at this and set up a distinction between what a Traffic Engineer (TE) and a Civil Engineer should be doing. A TE can sign off on traffic lights, control questions, and signal timing, but it is up to cities to decide how to use TEs. Committee Member Bahadori stated that all traffic device studies must be signed by a TE. Deleting the actual practice today will not change if we delete these lines. Committee Member Jones moved to remove Line 7 from the CA MUTCD. Motion Passed.

18-03 Proposed edits Section 4I.02 of the CA MUTCD

Discussion: John Castro from Caltrans, proposed changes to Section 4I.02 based on FHWA interpretation letters on the number of faces per lane at an onramp controlled by ramp meter. Mr. Castro said that many Caltrans districts are requesting to have a pole with a mast arm and to have one signal face per lane because Type 1 poles in the gore point get hit a lot. Committee member Maximous asked if there is a distinction between operating one car per green versus two or more in the different configuration. Mr. Castro stated that for the new designs, Caltrans is requesting that there be three color sections. Mr. Ouadah felt that we are getting rid of language that is very localized. Committee Member Bahadori moved to approve the Caltrans request. Motion was passed.

18-10 Intersection Control Evaluation – Draft Language

Discussion: Secretary Talada explained that at the May 2017 CTCDC meeting, Caltrans had presented its views on intersection control evaluation strategies for transportation improvement projects located on and off the state highway system. They had requested for Caltrans to develop draft language for providing additional guidance for local agencies. Caltrans has been using Intersection Control Evaluation for the past 20 years and would like to extend its use to the local agencies. Secretary Talada stated that this language encourages the local agencies to look at the roundabout option. It is a “should” statement rather than a “shall” statement. Committee Member Fleisch felt that the language points more at Caltrans than the local agencies. Secretary Talada suggested making it a “shall” statement. Mr. Pyburn stated that the public opposition notwithstanding, roundabouts save lives. In the 29 years that roundabouts have been installed in the U.S., 56 people have died at those intersections. There are cases where roundabouts were compared with signals, and the benefit-cost ratio is over 12 times higher with a roundabout than with a signal. Vice Chair Bahadori then suggested that it should be a “shall” statement. Committee Member Fleisch said that although we ought to be moving towards roundabouts, local agencies who have to deal with a public that’s not yet comfortable with them need to have more deliberate process. Committee Member Maximous suggested forming a subcommittee or finding a way to raise awareness of this serious issue throughout the state.

18-14 Request for installation of new Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) Sponsor Acknowledgement Signs

Discussion: Jaime Maldonado, MTC, reported that the California State Transportation Agency asked the FSP Partners to work on a pilot program to sponsor FSP. Joe Rouse of Caltrans stated that they are looking to roll out this pilot program possibly on a statewide basis. About 38 other locations across the United States have similar sponsorship programs in which a company puts its branding on the service patrol vehicles. Committee Member Hatfield asked how this

advertisement pilot would solve the problem of motorists who are unaware of FSP. Mr Rouse explained that the trucks themselves would be emblazoned with the sponsor's logo in order to enhance their visibility. Vice Chair Bahadori asked why this item was on the agenda if it is already allowed by FHWA and is in the federal manual. Committee Member Tong replied that there is no standard design for the sign. They had approved this sign by issuing a memo; currently they do not have a standard. Motion failed.

Summary of Accomplishments in 2018

- 4 items discussed from previous years (2013, 2015, 2016, and 2017)
- 19 items introduced in 2018
- 13 items completed in 2018
- 9 items approved for experimentation in 2018
- 2 items closed from pending experiments

MISCELLANEOUS

CTCDC Agendas, Meeting Minutes, Annual Reports, and other information are available on the Internet at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/ctcdc/>

SIGN SPECIFICATIONS

As provided in California Vehicle Code Sections 21400 and 21401, a list of the current California coded sign specifications used on streets and highways in California is available on the following website:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/tcd/specs.html>

MUTCD coded sign specifications are located in the FHWA Standard Highway Signs Book, available on the following FHWA website:

http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/ser-shs_millennium.htm

Respectfully submitted by Vijay Talada, Secretary, CTCDC.